

## REMARKS

Claim 7 was objected to on the basis that the phrase "the action windings" lacked proper antecedent basis in the claims. Claim 7 has been amended to delete the definite article from the phrase referring to the action windings and for this reason it is requested that this ground of objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 3-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Livings et al. (Livings).

Reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to include a recitation that the speed controlling device is provided within the motor chassis. The purpose of this arrangement is to protect the adjusting device. Attached hereto, are two drawings; Table 1 is a sketch of the motor disclosed by Livings and Table 2 is a sketch of the motor of the invention.

The upper figure of Table 1 shows a DC motor 4 which is provided with conventional brushes (reference X) and coils 1 and 1' disposed in series with the motor and the lower figure shows the same motor with a speed regulation device inserted between coil 1 and motor 4. There is no indication in Livings that shows or suggests the speed controlling device be provided according to the present invention.

Table 2 shows in the upper figure the motor of the present invention and in the lower figure the position in which the speed regulation device has been positioned. The speed regulation device is in series between the two portions of the induction coils of the motor. In this manner, the coils 1 and 1' may be considered as filtering devices.

The amended claims reflect the design features discussed above and for this reason, it is requested that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Livings in view of admitted prior art in the specification and claims 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Livings in view of Enescu.

Reconsideration is requested.

The Livings patent has been distinguished from amended claim 1 above which is the claim from which claims 6, 7 and 8 depend. As noted above, Claim 1 has been amended to include a recitation that the speed adjusting device is located inside the motor chassis. It is believed that this amendment avoids the rejection over the Livings patent and the admitted prior art regarding the phase chopper piloting circuit. The Enescu patent is concerned with suppressing radio interference induced by an asynchronous motor by using the inductance of the motor windings as a part of the noise filtering circuit. There is no suggestion to use an antijamming filter as a part of the variable speed control system according to the amended claims. For these reasons, it is requested that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

An early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



James V. Costigan  
Registration No.: 25,669

Mailing Address  
Hedman & Costigan, P.C.  
1185 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, N.Y. 10036  
(212) 302-8989

I hereby certify that this  
correspondence is being  
deposited with the United States Postal Service as  
first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on 5/19/06

